

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**Specification**

The title has been amended to more precisely identify the disclosed antenna by the Applicant.

**Claims**35 USC § 112 Rejection of Claims 5 - 10

The Examiner has rejected Claims 5 - 10 under 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite for insufficient antecedent basis. Claims 5 - 10 either have been canceled or the identified terms amended to correct errors in antecedent basis.

35 USC § 102(b) Rejection of Claims 1 - 5

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 - 5 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Campana [5,714,937].

Claim 1 -- The phrase “arranged facing said radiator with a prescribed separation” has been amended to more precisely claim the disclosed antenna by stating that “arranged to the rear of and facing towards said radiator with only a prescribed separation (D)”. Additionally, the claim has been amended to state “said radiator and said reflector has a range from about  $0.06 \lambda$  to  $0.15 \lambda$ , and the separation between the leading edges of two side sections in said reflector and said radiator is not greater than  $0.06 \lambda$ ”. Support for the amendments can be found at paragraphs [0043] and [0082] in the Specification, and Figure 19 [ $30 \text{ mm} \approx 0.06 \lambda$ ;  $70 \text{ mm} \approx 0.15 \lambda$ ].

The amended limitations in Claim 1 are not disclosed in Campana ‘937. In light of the above arguments and an absence of the disclosed claim limitations in the cited Prior Art reference, the Examiner is requested to remove the 102(b) rejection and allow the claim.

Claim 2 -- The claim has been canceled.

Claim 3 -- The amendments to Claim 1 of which Claim 3 is dependent, removes Campana ‘937 as Prior Art.

Claim 4 -- In addition to the amendments to Claim 1 of which Claim 4 is dependent, the claim has been amended to more precisely claim the disclosed antenna by adding the limitations: “said reflector is formed whereof a front face section facing towards said radiator, and bent sections thereof are bent” and “of said front face section is arranged to face towards said radiator, the two side edges thereof are bent to cross almost rectangularly against said front face section of the leading edge of said bent sections are arranged”. Support for the amendments can be found at paragraph [0085] in the Specification.

The amended limitations in Claim 4 are not disclosed in Campana ‘937. In light of the above arguments and an absence of the disclosed claim limitations in the cited Prior Art reference, the Examiner is requested to remove the 102(b) rejection and allow the claim.

Claim 5 -- The claim has been canceled.

#### 35 USC § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 6 - 10

The Examiner has rejected Claims 6 - 10 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campana [5,714,937] in view of Jeong-Kun et al. [6,606,067]

Claim 6 -- The claim has been amended to contain the same limitation as in Claim 1:

“and a reflector of planar form whereof both side sections, arranged to the rear of and facing towards said radiator with only a prescribed separation (D), are bent towards said radiator, where  $\lambda$  is the wavelength of the central frequency of the operating frequency band, characterized in that said prescribed separation (D) of said radiator and said reflector has a range from about  $0.06 \lambda$  to  $0.15 \lambda$ , and the separation between the leading edges of two side sections in said reflector and said radiator is not greater than  $0.06 \lambda$ .”

Support for the amendments to Claim 6 can be found at paragraphs [0043] and [0082] in the Specification, and Figure 19 [ $30 \text{ mm} \approx 0.06 \lambda$ ;  $70 \text{ mm} \approx 0.15 \lambda$ ]. The amended limitation is not disclosed in either Campana ‘937 or Jeong-Kun ‘067, or a combination of the references.

Claims 7 -- 10 are dependent of Claim 6 and therefore are also not disclosed in the cited Prior Art. Support for the amendments to Claim 9 can be found at paragraph [0085] in the Specification.

In light of the absence of the disclosed claim limitations in the cited Prior Art references, the Examiner is requested to remove the 103(a) rejection and allow Claims 6 - 10.

### **Conclusion**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9 are Pending. Claims 3 and 8 are Original. Claims 1, 4, 6, and 9 are Currently amended. Claims 2, 5, 7, and 10 are Canceled.

The claims have been amended to claim more precisely the disclosed antenna. No new matter has been added by the amendments to the claims.

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of the above remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is specifically requested and it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

No fees are believed due; however, please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to credit card information.

Date February 8, 2007

/KOH/  
Kirk Hahn  
Agent of Record  
Registration No. 51,763  
Customer Number 038051  
714-544-2934